

May 7, 1973

a pretty good position where Omaha is concerned now. You may not be later on. I am not the only one...I have no interest in the bill at all except the only interest I have is the interest that particularly women have conveyed to me that they are interested in the enlargement of swimming facilities. Outside of that, I have no interest. What the money does. It raises the roof in order that sometime in the future, in order to enlarge the seating capacity of the fieldhouse. The other thing it does, it widens, as I understand it, the area in which the field events of the University will be held and a third thing it will do, it will increase the size of swimming pool and I am no expert on swimming pools. But those that say they are, that it is not large enough to have any seating at all and I would hope you will not hold this bill up because it may be that they will go ahead without it and there is a limit in which they can hold up these things in order to restructure their bids on steel which has to be revised for the specific purpose of outline and I hope you will not bracket the bill and I oppose the bracketing of the bill.

PRESIDENT: Any other discussion of the motion. Senator Stahmer, do you want to close on your motion, then, to bracket LB 510.

SENATOR STAHMER: Well, again, I am not sure everyone in the body understands that indirectly this does have a fiscal impact and, Senator Carpenter, I am not trying to kill this measure. I voted for the fieldhouse and if we need an olympic swimming pool, fine. You know that I am quite liberal on all these matters and I'd like to help everybody but I'm just telling you that indirectly we don't know where we stand with Revenue sharing money. We don't know where we stand with capital construction money and until we do know, if we take 1.3 million, I don't care what it is for, what source it comes from, there is 1.3 million less for something else. Now whether it is the Beatrice State Home or any other thing, if the body is willing to adopt the Committee recommendations on capital and I don't know what the body is going to do or what the Governor will or won't veto on Revenue sharing. I am not trying to be difficult here. I am just trying to tell you what I see as a member of the Budget Committee and I know that this will have a fiscal impact. If we want to go ahead and vote this and everything else we want to consider, that's fine but to say that it would not have any fiscal impact is not correct.

PRESIDENT: Senator Syas, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SYAS: I want to ask Senator Stahmer a question. One quick one. You stated that you voted for the fieldhouse. That's news to me because the records doesn't show it last year. Show that you voted against it.

SENATOR STAHMER: I have the newspapers clippings right here in my desk, if you want to look at them. The only time I voted against it was when the Governor vetoed it and I thought a better monetary fund could be had. I sustained the Governor's...I voted to sustain the Governor's veto. After that was straightened out, then I again voted for it. All across...

SENATOR SYAS: Ya, but you voted....

SENATOR STAHMER: All across the Board up until the Governor vetoed it, I supported it.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, I want to point out that the motion before us is just merely to bracket LB 510 on Final Reading. Senator Kelly, do you have a question?

SENATOR KELLY: Mr. President, a question of Senator Stahmer.

SENATOR STAHMER: Yes.